To Ill.·. Bro.·.
Clinton F. Paige, 33.°
Sec. Gen. S. C. A. J. U. S.
with the compliments
of the author

[redacted]
HS 766
.B76
Copy 1

WHY

I REJECTED CERNEAUISM.

O. R. BOURNE.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HS96
B76

LC Control Number

tmp96 028940

Why I Rejected Cerneauism.

To all Worthy Free and Accepted Master Masons
throughout the Whole World:

This pamphlet is addressed to all worthy Master Masons seeking light on the subject of Scottish Rite Masonry. I found myself in a state of ignorance on that subject last summer. I soon discovered that there were two rival bodies of the rite in the District of Columbia. One of these, whose headquarters are at 908 and 910 Pennsylvania Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C., styles itself "The Supreme Council of Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General, 33d and last Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry for the United States, their Territories and Dependencies," whose Grand Commander is Bro.·. Bayliss; and the other, whose "House of the Temple" is at the corner of Third and E streets N. W., Washington, D. C., is entitled "The Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America," presided over by Judge Caswell, Grand Commander.

(Before proceeding further, allow me to substitute for the full titles the following abbreviations, viz.: The body on the Ave. for the first of these Bodies; N. J. for Northern Jurisdiction; S. J. for Southern Jurisdiction; G'd. Com. for Grand Commander; S. C's. for Supreme Councils; A. A. S. R. for Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite; U. S. A. for United States of America; S. G. I's. G. for Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General; G. O. for Grand Orient of France; and Sec. Gen. for Secretary-General.)

Finding this state of affairs, I saw at once that the only thing to do in order to settle the matter beyond dispute was to write to

some of the foreign S. C's. who have Grand Representatives with them of either of said bodies—that to go into the controversy on the subject would be interminable. I early realized that recognition by foreign S. C's. throughout the world really determined the whole matter. This principle is recognized in a manifesto now before me signed by said Bro.·. Bayliss, and published by his own S. C., under the caption, "Read, Mark, Learn, and Inwardly Digest," in answer to a document by Masons in Haverhill, Mass., headed, "Read and Reflect." It reads thus: "Recognition, according to Masonic Law, gives legitimacy, and, when a body is recognized, no other power has a lawful right to invade its jurisdiction. Regularity, to-day, hinges on the Scottish Rite Power first recognized in the United States by foreign bodies."

To test the matter, then, by the principle thus laid down by himself, I wrote to Bro.·. Bayliss, and received the following answer:

"Washington, *June* 3, 1897.

"Bro.·. O. R. Bourne.

"Sir: Your letter of the 2d inst. is received. In reply I will say that the Supreme Council I have the honor of representing corresponds with the G. O. and Supreme Council of Spain, and this Council does not recognize the Northern and Southern Jurisdictions. You ask about England, Scotland and Ireland. These bodies, as I understand, amount to but little, even if such exist more than on paper.

"You profess to be a minister, one who preaches truth. What do you think of bodies never recognized, but to gain recognition use the recognition accorded to another for the purpose of deception? This was done and I can prove it to the satisfaction of any body of men. The questions you have asked have been asked and answered many times. You are allowing yourself to be used—being put forward in a cause of which you will feel ashamed when you get through.

"I am to meet you at 6.30 to-morrow eve. I will answer what you may desire then, and I wish to meet the man who prompts you. I know the justice of the cause I have the honor of representing, and I am able to defend it with legitimate Masonic evidence. If you have any assertions to make, or if you know of any member of our body having been refused admission in any place in the world, fortify yourself with evidence.

"Very respectfully,

"M. W. Bayliss."

His reference to the G. O. is most unfortunate. Every tyro in Masonry is aware that the G. O. is not recognized by legitimate Masons the world over; *a fortiori,* not by English-speaking Masons; and that any Master Mason who in any way recognizes it, or is governed in his Masonic acts by its proceedings, thereby violates his solemn obligation. This to begin with. Regarding Spain, I have since ascertained that the S. C. he mentions in that country is a spurious body founded by his own S. C. With reference to England, Scotland and Ireland, the A. A. S. R. has in all three countries a most vital and most distinguished existence. His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales is Patron and S. G'd. I. G. of "the S. C. for England and Wales," and this S. C. was founded by the Northern Jurisdiction, U. S. A., in 1845. The Right Hon. the Earl of Kintore is Sov. G'd. Com. for Scotland, whose S. C. was established by that of France, the latter an entirely distinct body from the G. O., and itself founded from the S. J., U. S. A. Lastly, the Right Hon. Hedges Eyre Chatterton, Vice-Chancellor of Ireland, is Sov. G'd. Com. for Ireland, whose S. C. was established in 1829 direct by the same that founded that of France. Permit me here to state that the N. J. was founded by the S. J., so the S. C's. of England, Scotland, Ireland and France were established directly or indirectly by the S. J. I had requested Bro.·. Bayliss to give me the name of his Grand Correspondent in Belgium in addition to those in the above-named countries; but he makes no allusion whatever to Belgium in the above letter to me. In fact, as you see, he did not give me the name of a single correspondent of his S. C. in any country in the whole world. I wish my readers to bear this fact in mind.

Having thus failed altogether to obtain the names of Grand Correspondents from Bro.·. Bayliss, I procured from Bro.·. Webber, Sec. Gen., the names of his Grand Correspondents in the five above-named countries. I at once wrote to all five excepting that of Ireland, besides addressing the G'd. Com's. of Ireland and Scotland. I received replies from England, Scotland and Belgium. None came from Ireland or France. The three replies received are printed below, along with my letter to the Sec. Gen. of Belgium. You will see by them that the English and Scotch Sec's. Gen. both state emphatically that their S. C's. do not recognize any body of A. A. S. R. in the U. S. A. as legitimate but

the N. and S. J's. Bro.·. Lindsay Mackersy, Sec. Gen. for Scotland, further assures me that if I take the degrees under either of the above jurisdictions I may be certain that I am not getting them from a spurious source.

But it is from Belgium that the most minute and most conclusive answer comes. This admirable letter from Ill.·. Bro. Gustave Jottrand verily sets this vexed question forever at rest with all candid minds. He starts out by stating that the body on the Ave. "is not recognized as having any right to that title by *any* of the real Supreme Councils of this rite established in Europe." This first statement is tremendous. Not recognized by any of the S. C's. in Europe! Here is the principle of recognition applied with a vengeance. The body on the Ave. is *not recognized by a single European S. C.!* Then he proceeds: "The fact that it [the body on the Ave.] declares the Grand Constitution of 1786 'apocryphal' suffices to render impossible all relations between it and ourselves, for all the European Supreme Councils *hold them to be authentic,*" &c. The failure of the body on the Ave. to acknowledge the authenticity of the Constitutions of 1786 is the one great obstacle in the way of its recognition by the S. C's. of Europe.

He next states that delegates from twenty-two S. C's. of the A. A. S. R., who met at Lausanne in 1875, reaffirmed their strict adherence to said Constitutions, and "without the slightest alteration maintained the fundamental principles established by [these] ancient documents." I would have my reader observe that in 1875 there were not over twenty-six S. C's. in the whole world, so this conference at Lausanne was representative of the universal A. A. S. R. This is going beyond Europe into all the world. He again uses the adjective "all"—"they all acknowledged the Constitutions of 1786." So these Constitutions are acknowledged by "*all*" A. A. S. R. Masons in the world.

Regarding his statement that Count d'Esterno brought to France a copy of these very Constitutions, freshly approved by Frederick the Great, let me quote what Ill.·. Bro.·. Albert Pike says upon this whole question: "If we knew them to be genuine, we should not regard them as binding on us because Frederick sanctioned them. He had no power to make laws for all the Scottish Masons in the world. Masonic laws are not binding on

us because such and such a person made them; but, if it at all, because when we became a Mason, or received a degree, we accepted them as the law of the rite or degree, and swore to observe them."—*Pike, "Foulhouzism and Cerneauism Scourged," p.* 90.

Next, they were from their first arrival "received with respect" by the Masons of the U. S. "The Masons of the A. A. S. R. were numerous" here (not a small, dormant or moribund body), and they "regarded Berlin," not Bordeaux, as the directing source of their rite. The body on the Ave. has gone in quite another direction for guidance, viz., to Bordeaux. He affirms, moreover, "that the founders of the S. C. of Charleston in 1801 acted according to the principles established in 1786 in that city [Berlin]." European authorities hold that the founders of the first authentic and recognized S. C. in the world were guided in their proceedings by the Berlin Constitutions of 1786.

Now he comes to the introduction of the Charlestonian rite into France. One of said founders, Count Alexandre François Auguste de Grasse-Tilly, son of the Count de Grasse, who defeated the English fleet sent to succor Lord Cornwallis at the close of the Revolution, carried "the organization to France in 1804, and it was there accepted favorably" for reasons assigned. Then was founded, on September 22, 1804, "The S. C. of the 33d and last Degree A. A. S. R. for France and its Dependencies," *i. e.*, "The Supreme Council of France," a totally different body from the G. O., the latter having begun in 1773. The Supreme Council of France thus established has lasted from that day to this, is the only body in France with which the S. C. of the S. J., U. S. A., corresponds, and also is the only body of the A. A. S. R. in France recognized by the S. C's. of the rite throughout the world. The G. O. even finally acknowledged its authority on November 6, 1841.

Next, he gives the priceless information that "*All the active Supreme Councils of the rite in the whole world are sprung from that of Charleston*"—literally, "are the children of"— an absolutely unconditional assertion. "All active S. C's.," all without exception, in the whole world, derive their existence from the S. C. of Charleston, South Carolina, U. S. A., founded in 1801, now known as the S. C. for the S. J., U. S. A. That settles it!

To take Bro.·. Bayliss' own principle, the S. C. for the S. J., U. S. A., founded at Charleston in 1801, is the "*Scottish Rite Power first recognized in the United States by foreign bodies,*" for the S. C's. of France, of Belgium, of England, and of all countries where active S. C's. are found, recognize that of Charleston as the parent of all. It is, therefore, the Great Parent of all Scottish Rite bodies, not only in the United States, but in the whole world.

Ill.·. Bro.·. Jottrand then demonstrates how impossible it was for Cerneau to have had the necessary authority to create a S. C. in New York. "To enable Cerneau to found a S. C. in New York it were necessary that he should have received the 33d degree from a regular source [a S. C.]; now *it does not appear that he ever even claimed that this was the case.*" Cerneau never even claimed that he had received the 33d degree from a S. C. There is no authentic record anywhere of any such claim having been made by Cerneau himself. If he wanted to start the A. A. S. R. in the United States, the first thing for him to have done was to create a S. C.. That is the way in which it invariably is done and must be done. According to the Bayliss manifesto, he established a "Sov. G'd. Consistory" in New York on October 28, 1807. He went the wrong way about it. A Consistory does not found the A. A. S. R., consisting of thirty-three degrees. It takes a S. C. to do that, for the simple reason that a Consistory does not govern the 33d degree. Cerneau brought with him only twenty-five degrees. Even if he had come clothed with lawful authority and established a S. C., he was six years too late, and was an outlawed invader of pre-occupied territory, according to the Bayliss manifesto, for the Charleston S. C. of South Carolina was founded in 1801. The fact of the matter is that Joseph Cerneau never did claim to found the A. A. S. R. with its thirty-three degrees at all.

As a natural consequence Bro.·. Jottrand goes on to say: "All Masonic bodies that regard him [Cerneau] as their founder, *perpetrate an unlawful usurpation of title and name* when they call themselves S. C's. of G. I's. G., 33d and last degree of the A. A. S. R.—there is no doubt about that." Why that is the very thing that the body on the Ave. does. It does most assuredly regard him [Cerneau] as its founder, and therefore most assuredly

guilty of "unlawful usurpation of title and name" when it calls itself by its present boastful title. We do not care to be epithetical It is sufficient that *there is no doubt* that it has been and is now practising "unlawful usurpation" by arrogating to itself the designation of a S. C. of the A. A. S. R.

The next declaration that he makes is: "We in Europe consider this question absolutely settled by the numerous writings of Illustrious Albert Pike." Now this is the man whom the Cerneaus have in every way possible held up to odium, abuse and vilification, and about whom they have invented all kinds of defamatory legends. In Europe, it appears, he is considered the very highest Masonic authority on the subject of S. R. Masonry in general and Cerneauism in particular. So Cerneauism has no standing at all in Europe, or, for that matter, anywhere else! Albert Pike has completely demolished it. His writings have put poor Cerneau quietly to bed in perfect bliss with his twenty-five "Degrees of Perfection."

He then refers to a manifesto by said Bro.·. Bayliss, just received by him. Having read it attentively, Bro.·. Jottrand declares that it contains nothing to change what he had above stated to be his opinion, that "there are always [in said manifesto] *the same allegations that have been a hundred times refuted, and the same want of logic and consistency*" A most important conclusion! First, said manifesto is not of a character calculated to alter the opinion of any one at all familiar with the subject and well read in Masonic history; in other words, only the ignorant could be deluded by it. In the next place, the allegations made in it over the signature of Bro.·. Bayliss have been refuted a hundred times. Of course, this is hyperbole; but it means in plain English that his assertions are always the same old, trumped-up, rehashed statements that he persists in dragging out again to the light of day, although they will not stand the test of historical evidence, and have been proved incontestably over and over again to have no foundation in fact. Finally, there is "always the same want of logic and consistency." Since then his arguments are illogical they are *valueless*, only calculated to entrap those unfamiliar with close and sustained reasoning. And there is inconsistency! The statements made all through this manifesto contradict each other, will not hold together, and, therefore, *the whole thing falls to pieces.*

He now arrives at the point that has caused so much discussion, viz., Are the Constitutions of 1762, framed at Bordeaux, France, the fundamental law of the A. A. S. R.? He thus proceeds: "If the brethren who published this manifesto wish to recognize only the Constitution of the Rite of Perfection, passed at Bordeaux in 1762 as law, they are at liberty to do it; but if so, they cannot after that speak either of the 33d degree or of the A. A. S. R., for nothing of all that exists in the Constitutions of 1762." Here a little explanation is necessary. On August 27, 1761, Stephen Morin was commissioned "Grand Master Inspector," with power to administer in the New World "the Sublime Degree of Perfection" or Rite of Heredom, being twenty-five in number. Article 2 of the Constitutions of Bordeaux, passed September 21, 1762, declares that the Rite of Perfection or Heredom "is regularly divided into twenty-five degrees," beginning with "Apprentice" and ending with "Sublime Prince of the Royal Secret," twenty-fifth degree. These Constitutions were "transmitted to our Bro.·. Stephen Morin, Grand Inspector of all the Lodges [not S. C's., or Consistories, or even Chapters] in the New World." This is another thing altogether from the A. A. S. R., which consist of thirty-three degrees, that is, eight degrees more than the Rite of Perfection, and the degrees above the 18th (Rose Croix) arranged in a different order, with five degrees entirely new and mentioned in no other rite, viz., 23d, Chief of Tabernacle; 24th, Prince of Tabernacle; 25th, Knight of Brazen Serpent; 26th, Prince of Mercy; 33d, S. G. I's. G. The last, and the last only, with its thirty-three degrees, is the A. A. S. R., as now accepted and recognized by the Masonic world. To say that "the A. A. S. R." is the same as "the Rite of Perfection," is equivalent to saying that "Magna Charta" (the Great Charter of England) is the same as "the laws of Edward the Confessor." As all logicians know, similarity is not sameness. Therefore, Bro.·. Jottrand truly says that Masons who acknowledge the Constitutions of 1762 as the fundamental law of their rite, cannot claim the 33d degree, or proclaim to the world that they have the A. A. S. R., for said Constitutions did not originate the 33d degree, have not a word to say about S. G. I's. G., and therefore did not create the A. A. S. R. That is exactly the position of the body on the

Ave. They do acknowledge the Constitutions of 1762, and repudiate the Constitutions of 1786 that brought the A. A. S. R. into existence; they, therefore, judged by their own claims and declarations, have got only "the Rite of Perfection," have no connection whatever with the A. A. S. R., and are not 33d degree Masons.

Bro.·. Jottrand further attests the fact that the estimation in which the authority of Berlin was held at the close of the last century by Masons is confirmed by a contemporary, a Bro.·. Shirreff. He gives vent to his astonishment at certain Masons in these words: "It is strange that reasonable people *can* believe in the Constitutions of 1762, that are only known by the copy of them that de Grasse-Tilly brought back from the United States, and refuse to believe in those of 1786 that are precisely in the same condition." Both Constitutions have reached us in exactly the same way, namely, by the copies of them brought back from the U. S. A. by Count de Grasse-Tilly. That is the only way in which both have been preserved. They both stand or fall together. If you reject one you must reject the other.

He alludes to the fact that Hughan, the great English Masonic authority, has been convinced of the authenticity of both by reading the works of Pike.

It is thus conclusively shown by these letters from England, Scotland and Belgium that the body on the Ave. has no recognition by any genuine S. C. in the whole world; that its repudiation of the Constitutions of 1786 debars all fraternal intercourse between it and all real European S. C's.; that a congress of all the legitimate S. C's. in the world in 1875 most heartily endorsed said Constitutions; that the latter became the basis of the true Scottish Rite in the U. S. A., the parent S. C. of the world, that of Charleston, South Carolina, having been founded on its principles; that de Grasse-Tilly, authorized by said S. C., introduced the present rite into France; that "all active S. C's. in the whole world are the children of the S. C. of Charleston;" that Joseph Cerneau never even claimed to be a 33d, therefore could not create a S. C.; that all so-called S. C's. that call him their founder are usurpers of name and title; that the whole matter concerning all Cerneau bodies has, in European estimation, been set at rest by Albert Pike; that the Bayliss manifesto simply re-

*

peats oft-refuted assertions, is valueless through want of logic, and self-destructive through inconsistency; that Masons who adhere to the Constitutions of 1762 have not got the Scottish Rite; finally, that both the Constitutions of 1762 and 1786 must either stand or fall together.

Masonic brethren will now clearly realize that Cerneauism has no standing in the Masonic world. There are, as I am informed, only two Cerneau bodies outside of the U. S., one in Canada and the other in Spain, both started by the Cerneaus here. The true S. C. for Canada was granted authority to organize from England, so this Canadian body has no recognition there. Down in Mexico, a Cerneau Mason would be treated with scorn and contempt; whereas Ill.·. Bro.·. Allison Nailor, representing the S. C., S. J., U. S. A., was received by President Diaz, G'd. Com., and his S. C. in December, 1895, with every possible mark of amity and honor.

While I decline to enter into controversy on the subject, if what is published in this pamphlet is not sufficient, I shall take pleasure in again writing to Ill.·. Bro.·. Jottrand, who freely offers to give me further details. The original letters from England, Scotland and Belgium I have deposited at the "House of the Temple," corner of Third and E streets, where I will be pleased to meet any brother at any time and adduce my authorities.

It is always well to have two strings to one's bow, so I subjoin a letter in the appendix from Bro.·. Bayliss, in which he condemns the very body of which he has since become, and now is, G'd. Com. There is no getting around this letter. It is both genuine and authentic. I can prove this. He was expelled from the Seymour body about 1888, and, before being admitted into the Thompson body, wrote this letter.

It is necessary to explain about the Seymour and his own (the Thompson) body. In 1860 a split occurred in the N. J., when K. H. Van Rensellaer left the S. C., N. J., and formed a rival S. C. of his own. Thereupon, Edw. A. Raymond, G'd. Com. of the former, united with the Edw. B. Hays (Cerneau) Council, the united S. C. taking the name of the latter, with Hays as G'd. Com. Hopkins Thompson resigned as Hays' L't. G'd. Com. on October 20, 1864, in favor of John L. Lewis. Charges of

unmasonic conduct were preferred against Harry J. Seymour in September, 1865, which charges were investigated by a committee of three (all old Cerneau men), and he was expelled December 4, 1865. The united S. C. resumed the name of "S. C. for N. J., U. S. A.," December, 1866, and the Rensellaer faction returned to the true fold in 1867, thus reconciling all the discordant elements. Now the men who set the two present Cerneau bodies going assert that the above dissolution of the united S. C's. and revival of the S. C. for the N. J. was clandestinely and illegally done. It can be proved by overwhelming evidence that this assertion is false. Every 33d in the united body was duly summoned to attend the meeting in Boston, December, 1866, at which above dissolution and revival were effected. Thirteen out of fifteen active and ten out of fifteen honorary 33ds attended. All the members present, old Cerneau men and all, swore fealty to the revived body. The summons addressed to Rev. J. Clarke Hagey (Methodist minister), 33d, from Pennsylvania, who since resided in this city, is now in the possession of Bro.·. William R. Singleton, the R. W. G'd. Sec. of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia. Bro.·. Hagey most solemnly avers that the whole transaction was done in every detail in a fair, proper and lawful manner.

If the source is impure the stream itself cannot be pure. Now, Harry J. Seymour and Hopkins Thompson are the sources of the two streams of Cerneauism. Thompson's Council was started in 1881. His claims are most effectually disposed of by Bro.·. Bayliss. The latter declares in extract that Gorman and his body (the same one founded by Thompson) "are neither honest nor truthful." That, mind you, is now his (Bayliss') own body—the body on the Ave. (See extract from his letter on last page.)

As for Seymour, whose Council began in 1878, we have seen above that he was expelled. He sought readmission into the N. J., threatening to start a new Cerneau body if his appeal were not granted. It was refused. It is claimed that Hays "had authorized Seymour to resuscitate the Cerneau Council." Hays could have done no such thing. He fully acquiesced in the dissolution of the united S. C. and revival of the old Raymond body, died a member of the N. J., was buried by it, and his six pallbearers were 33ds of the same, whose names I can give if so

desired. Observe, there was not a trace of Cerneauism from 1866 to 1878, and was then revived by an expelled Mason through soreness and spite.

Finally, the great Cerneau historian, Dr. Robert B. Folger, writing in the New York Dispatch of 1874 about said union of the Raymond-Hays-Rensellaer factions, says: "We believe it to be the sincere desire of every brother of our beautiful rite that this union may continue for all time, one and indivisible." Yet he has since pretended that he was deceived by said proceedings, and knew nothing about them until 1881. What are honest Masons to think of such men!

O. R. BOURNE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., U. S.,
December 15, 1897.

APPENDIX A.

1.—Letter from Rev. O. R. Bourne to Bro.·. Gustave Jottrand. Similar letters were addressed to the Sec's. Gen. for England, Scotland and France, and G'd. Com's. of Ireland and Scotland.

2.—Reply to above from Bro.·. Lindsay Mackersy, Sec. Gen. of S. C. for Scotland.

3.—Reply to above from Bro.·. W. Portlock Dadson, Sec. Gen. of S. C. for England.

4.—Reply to above from Bro.·. Gustave Jottrand, Sec. Gen. of S. C. for Belgium.

June 17, 1897.

To. M. Gustave Jottrand,
Sec. Gen. of the S. C. of 33d and last Degree of the A. A. S. R. for Belgium.
Rue du Marché aux Poulets, 20, Brussels.

Dear Sir and Very Ill.·. Bro.·. I take the liberty of coming to you in that spirit of confidence that brother Masons have to one another for some needful information, as I understand you are in a position to give it.

I desire to know about "Cerneauism" (as it is called) in the United States. Its governing body arrogates to itself the name of "The Supreme Council of the A. A. S. R. for the U. S. A., their Territories and Dependencies," and claims to be "the only legitimate S. C. on American soil." It classes the Constitutions of 1786 (supposed to have been made in Berlin) as "apocryphal," and proclaims the Constitutions of 1762 (made in Bordeaux) as the true organic law of the A. A. S. R. It, too, asserts a different origin for said rite from that claimed for it by the S. C. for the Southern Jurisdiction of the U. S., viz., that said rite was propagated by one Stephen Morin in the French West Indies, who was sent there for that purpose in 1761, and brought to the United States by Joseph Cerneau in 1807; whereas the latter claims that the true originator or reviver of the rite was Count de Grasse-Tilly. Into its history since its creation in this country it is not necessary to go. A Supreme Council once estab-

lished in this country, no other can legitimately intrude. It is claimed that a S. C. had already been established in the U. S. A. (viz., at Charleston, S. C.) when Cerneau came.

The different superior bodies of Masons (working the degrees above the three symbolic degrees), as I understand, have had no constituents at their inception, but were self-created by one individual gathering followers around him, and they together establishing a rite. If they could get recognition for their rite from Masons throughout the world, then it stood; otherwise it fell. Now, is Cerneauism acknowledged universally? If not, it falls to the ground. Is not this true? It is stated that Belgium obtained her rite from France, and France from the S. C. for the S. J., U. S. A., the latter having commissioned Count de Grasse. It appears "that the hand of time effaced in France the memory of those degrees which had gone forth from her bosom, * * * and that they were brought back thither as strangers, and none claimed title to them." De Grasse styles himself creator of the Supreme Councils in the Kingdoms of France, Italy, Naples, Spain, the Low Countries, &c.

I would esteem it a great favor if you would enlighten me on this whole subject. Please quote authorities if possible. I have the pleasure of enclosing Bro.·. Frederick Webber's (Sec. Gen.) card. Be so kind as to affix the seal of your Supreme Council.

Yrs. very truly and frat'rn'ly,

OBRÈ RALPH BOURNE.

EDINBURGH, *July* 6, 1897.

Dear Sir and Brother: Lord Kintore has forwarded to me your letter to him of date 17th June ulto., and the letter to me of same date therein enclosed.

In reply, I beg to inform you that this Council recognizes the Supreme Council of the Southern Jurisdiction, U. S. A., and the Supreme Council of the Northern Jurisdiction, U. S. A., as lawful Councils of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, and that it recognizes no other body in America claiming to be a Supreme Council of that rite.

In these circumstances, if you will be so good as apply to the Grand Secretaries, either of the Northern or Southern Jurisdiction, you will get from them the information you desire, and if you take the degrees under either of these Constitutions you may feel assured that you are not taking them from a spurious body. I remain, dear sir and brother, yours fraternally,

L. MACKERSY, 33°
G. G. Sec. H. E.

Rev. O. R. BOURNE,
1041 32*d Street N. W., Washington, D. C., U. S. America.*

33 Golden Square,
London, W., *July* 14, 1897.

Dear Sir: I am desired by the Supreme Council, 33°, of England and Wales, to acknowledge your letter of 18th June, and in reply to inform you that they can only enter into the points raised by you through the officials of the Supreme Councils with which we are in amity, and which are the Supreme Council, 33°, of the N. J., U. S. America, and the Supreme Council, S. J., U. S. America, which alone are recognized here.

I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

W. PORTLOCK DADSON,
Sec. Sup. Council, 33°

The Rev. O. R. Bourne,
1041 32*d Street N. W., Washington, D. C., U. S. America.*

---

14 Rue du Persil, à Bruxelles,
Valley of Brussels, Belgium, *July* 17, 1897.

The Grand Chancellor, Secretary-General, of the Supreme Council of Belgium, to the Very Illustrious Bro.·. O. R. Bourne, *Valley of Washington, U. S. A.*

Very Dear and Very Illustrious Bro.·. I proceed to answer as well as I can your fraternal letter of June 17 last. The Masonic body established in New York, and styling itself "The Supreme Council of Sovereign Grand Inspectors-General, 33d and last Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite for the United States of America, their Territories and Dependencies," is not recognized as having any right to that title by any of the real Supreme Councils of this rite established in Europe; it has no official relations with them, and it does not interchange with them either Grand Representatives or guarantors of friendship. The fact that it declares the Grand Constitutions of 1786 "apocryphal" suffices to render all relations impossible between it and ourselves, for all the European Supreme Councils hold them to be authentic, and find in them the origin of their name and of their organization. In 1875 there assembled at Lausanne, Switzerland, the delegates from twenty-two (22) Supreme Councils of our rite; they all acknowledged the Constitutions of 1786 and the additions to them as the basis of their labors. They added certain modifications of detail, but, without the slightest alteration, maintained the fundamental principles established by the ancient documents. In our opinion, there was in Paris as early as 1787 a Supreme Council of Grand Inspectors of the 33d Degree established by Count d'Esterno, ambassador of France near Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, who [d'Esterno] brought back with him the Constitutions approved by this mon-

arch, but the revolution which commenced in 1789 prevented this germ from growing. It has been otherwise in the United States. We do not know who carried thither the Constitutions of 1786; but they reached there, and they were received with respect. Masons of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite were numerous there, and regarded Berlin as the central director of their activity. It is according to the principles established in 1786 in that city (Berlin) that the founders of the Supreme Council of Charleston in 1801 have acted. One of these, the Count de Grasse-Tilly, introduced the organization into France in 1804, and it was there accepted favorably, because certain Masons there had preserved the remembrance of the efforts of Count d'Esterno. All the active Supreme Councils of the rite in the whole world are sprung from [the children of that] of Charleston [South Carolina]. To enable "Cerneau" to found a Supreme Council at New York, it were necessary that he should have received the 33d degree from a regular source. Now it does not appear that he [Cerneau] ever even claimed that this was the case. All the Masonic bodies that consider him their founder perpetrate an unlawful usurpation of title and name when they call themselves Supreme Councils of Grand Inspectors-General, 33d and last Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite—*there is no doubt about that.* We in Europe consider this question as absolutely settled by the numerous writings of the Illustrious Albert Pike, which you certainly know and have doubtless carefully read.

I have just received from Bro.·. John C. Backer, Secretary-General, 63 Bleecker street, New York, a printed manifesto signed by Bro.·. Bayliss, Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, about the regularity of which you ask my opinion. I have read it attentively. It does not contain anything of a nature to alter my opinion; there are always the same allegations that have been a hundred times repeated, and the same want of logic and consistency.

If the brethren of the Masonic body that published this manifesto wish to recognize as law only the Constitutions of the Rite of Perfection, adopted at Bordeaux in 1762, they are at liberty to do it; but, if so, they cannot after that speak either of the 33d degree or of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, for nothing of all that exists in the Constitutions of 1762.

I hope I have satisfied your desire. We do not know any more on the subject than Pike knew about it. I am ready to give you more details if you desire them. The fact that Masons recognize the authority of Berlin at the close of the last century is confirmed, in addition to the evidence already collected by Pike, by the letters of a Bro.·. Shirreff of 1785, published by Sadler in his work, "Masonic Facts and Fictions," p. 156, London, 1887.

It is strange that reasonable people can believe in the Constitutions of 1762, that are only known by the copy of them that De Grasse-Tilly brought back from the United States, and refuse to believe in those of 1786 that are precisely in the same condition. (See Gould, "History of Free-Masonry, vol. 5, pp. 128 and 129.) Note that if Gould does not believe in the authenticity of either one or the other, Hughan does believe in them since reading the works of Pike. I have made a synopsis in a pamphlet that I send you of the proofs furnished by this last [Pike].

Accept very dear and very illustrious brother my most sincerely fraternal saluation.

{Seal of the Supreme Council of Belgium.}

GUSTAVE JOTTRAND, 33°.

APPENDIX B.

Letter from Bro.·. M. W. Bayliss to a friend, with an extract. This letter and said extract from one he wrote November 29, 1890, are printed in what is termed an "Excerpt from an Allocution delivered by M.·. Ill.·. Philip F. D. Hibbs, 33°, at Annual Rendezvous of the Sovereign Grand Consistory, A. A. S. Rite, Boston, Mass., June 26, 1893."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December* 11, 1890.

My Dear Sir and Bro.·. Your favor of the 8th instant came duly to hand. In reply I will state that it is not my intention to champion the cause of any of the claimants to Scottish Rite supremacy. My aim and object is to give you such historical facts as I can with the view of enabling you to arrive at a correct judgment in regard to the claims of what is known as the Gorman body.

You say you do not agree with me in what I wrote about the claims of the Seymour-Peckham body; that Seymour was legally expelled, &c. I do not ask you to agree with me at this time. The legality of the Seymour-Peckham body is not being considered by us; it is the legality of the Gorman body we are discussing; but after we get through with it we can discuss the legality of the other one if you so desire. You say that the Gorman body does not recognize the powers of Robinson to resuscitate the Raymond body after it had been legally merged into the Hayes body. I beg to differ with you. The organizers of the Gorman body were parties to the actions of Robinson and assisted him. I will back up this assertion with evidence and ask you as a favor to please quote your authority for any statements you may make in support of the claims of the Gorman body in future. If you will do this, it will save me considerable trouble, as I can then pick out just such evidence as I may need.

The published proceedings of what is known as the Gorman body for the year 1881, pp. 5 to 8, contain the preambles and

resolutions adopted on their organization, and you must admit that their own records should be good evidence in their own case at least. The preambles and resolutions were presented by Mr. Hopkins Thompson, and after setting forth well-known historical facts, Mr. Thompson, who issued the call for the meeting, continuing, states: "Now, therefore, I, Hopkins Thompson, Lieut. Gr. Commander under Ill.·. Bro.·. Edmund B. Hayes, having summoned for advice and assistance past officers and members of the Supreme Council, and receiving their consent and co-operation, do hereby condemn and utterly repudiate the said treasonable action of the aforesaid Simon W. Robinson, his associates and abettors, as arbitrary, unconstitutional and void; and that I do now (by virtue of my office aforesaid under Ill.·. Bro.·. Hayes) declare and proclaim the labors of the Supreme Council of Sov. Gr. Inspectors-General of the 33° of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free-Masonry for the United States of America, their Territories and Dependencies, resumed, and I call upon all brethren of the rite, at any time, owing obedience to the Supreme Council, to resume their proper places."

From the foregoing you can clearly see that Mr. Thompson claimed the right to recognize the old Hayes body by virtue of having been Lieutenant Grand Commander of that body under E. B. Hayes, and that he is the man who brought what is known as the Gorman body into being. Now, who is this Mr. Thompson, and did he possess the powers he claimed? On this question, I take it, the legality of the Gorman body stands. Mr. Hopkins Thompson was the Lieutenant Grand Commander of the Hayes body under E. B. Hayes, until October 20, 1864, when he resigned the office and was succeeded by John L. Lewis. Reprint p. 190 shows that the Ill.·. Second Lieutenant Grand Commander Hopkins Thompson offered his resignation of office, and that John L. Lewis was immediately elected and installed as his successor, so that whatever rights Mr. Thompson may have had he certainly had none as the last Lieutenant Grand Commander under Hayes; John L. Lewis was the Lieutenant Grand Commander when it is claimed Mr. Hayes resigned his office in December, 1865, and continued in the same office under Mr. Robinson until May, 1867. Mr. Thompson attended the meetings of the body right along after his resignation; was present when the Constitution was unlawfully changed in 1864; was present when the old Raymond members resumed their old name, "Supreme Council for the Northern Jurisdiction," October 22, 1865; was present on the same day when Paige and Sickles were appointed a committee to visit the Southern Council, and took part in all the movements of the Raymond-Robinson people for the capture of the Hayes organization. Any fair-minded man must admit that the Hayes body would never appoint a commiteee to visit

the Southern Council, and any man who knows anything about the workings of Scottish Rite Masonry knows that no member of the Hayes body would be admitted to the Southern Council. Messrs. Paige and Sickles, the committee appointed to visit the Southern Council, October 22, 1865, visited that body in December, 1865, and reported the result of their labors to the Robinson-Raymond-Thompson party the same month and continued.

December 13, 1865, Ebenezer H. Shaw, a 33d owing allegiance to the Southern Council, was admitted as a visitor to the Robinson Council. If this had been a Hayes or a Cerneau Council, Mr. Pike would have expelled Mr. Shaw. The next day after this visit, it is claimed, *Seymour was expelled* for saying that this Robinson Council was illegitimate and spurious, and that he could prove it.

June 5, 1866. Mr. Thompson was present when Robinson delivered an address which would open the eyes of any honest man, provided they were closed to the movements going on. Before quoting from that address I wish to call your attention to the fact that the Gorman people lay great stress upon a resolution which was passed at this meeting, changing the time of the annual meeting. Mr. Thompson lays particular stress upon this point, and such being the fact he cannot plead to having heard the resolution and being ignorant of the address delivered at the same time.

At this meeting, held June 5, 1866, reprint p. 212, Mr. Robinson delivered the following address:

"If rightly I interpret the signs of the times an unusual amount of important business will come before the Council at its present session which will require patient and calm consideration. This I doubt not it will receive, and that your decisions will be such as will stand the test of the severest scrutiny. It will be remembered that at the last meeting of the Council, December, 1865, its attention was called to the renewal of those friendly relations with the Southern Council, which had been interrupted by the defection of one of the active members of the Council over which M.·. P.·. E. A. Raymond presided, who called to his aid others of every other line of character to assist in its overthrow and get possession of its funds. Every obstacle to the accomplishment of this purpose excited their indignation and hatred, and they did not hesitate at anything, however reprehensible or contrary to Masonic law.

"As conservator of the honor and integrity of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, the Sovereign Grand Commander of the Northern Jurisdiction felt bound by his obligations to resist by all the means in his power the execution of their plans. To do this the Northern Council was forced into the unfortunate dilemma, disapproved and deemed irregular by the Southern Council. The

importance and desirableness of maintaining friendly relations with all regular Councils, especially with the Southern, must be apparent to every brother. And now to the question: What more can be done to accomplish this desirable result?"

Mr. Thompson lays great stress upon the address delivered by Mr. Robinson in Boston, December 13, 1866, but pays no attention to this one. Compare the two and see how lame the criticism of Mr. Thompson is. Mr. Thompson and his followers claim that they were ignorant of what was transpiring or did transpire until the appearance of what is known as the "reprint" in 1881. Let us analyze this address a little and see whether or not Mr. Thompson could have been ignorant. Mr. Robinson said: "It will be remembered that at the last meeting of this Council, December 13–14, 1865." What Council? Mr. Gorman, I presume, would answer the Hayes-Robinson Council. Was it the Hayes-Robinson Council? I say, No. Why? Because Mr. Robinson distinctly states that "its attention was called to the renewal of those friendly relations with the Southern Council." The Hayes-Robinson Council could not renew friendly relations with the Southern Council, consequently it must be admitted that those friendly relations were renewed by the revived Raymond body, with Mr. Robinson presiding as the successor of Mr. A. Raymond. Robinson says further in his address that those friendly relations were "interrupted by the defection of one of the active members of the Council over which M.·. P.·. E. A. Raymond presided." This shows conclusively that the Hayes body was not being considered; Robinson and the others thought they had captured it. The active member who interrupted their friendly relations was Killean Van Rensellaer, who never was a member of the Hayes body. Continuing, Mr. Robinson said that, "as conservator of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, the Sovereign Grand Commander of the Northern Jurisdiction (E. A. Raymond) felt bound by his obligations to resist." Resist what? The machinations of Messrs. Van Rensellaer, Carson and Co., who had interrupted the friendly relations existing between the Raymond and Pike Councils and forced Raymond and his followers to seek shelter under the sheltering wings of Cerneau. To do this, Robinson says, "The Northern Council was forced into the unfortunate dilemma, disapproved and deemed irregular by the Southern Council." What difference would it make to the Hayes Council whether Pike declared the Northern Council spurious or not? Not a particle. Robinson was simply addressing the revived Raymond body and bewailing their misfortunes. In all candor, I ask you if you believe that any man could listen to the above address and be deceived? Do you believe that a man intelligent enough to occupy the second place in a Supreme Coun-

cil could be deceived? I am free to say that it does not seem possible to me. The substance of the address is that the Raymond Council for the Northern Jurisdiction was forced to the wall by the Van Rensellaer faction in their own Council, and Robinson wails because Pike considered the Raymond-Robinson faction as irregular. Their whole aim was to get back into the good graces of Mr. Pike, and with the assistance of Mr. Thompson and a few others, who now claim they were deceived. Mr. Robinson and his party came pretty near stealing what there were of the Hayes body. Robinson should have continued this address and said that Raymond, himself and others sought refuge in flight from Van Rensellaer & Co., and found a haven of rest under the shelterings wings of Cerneau. Instead of saying this, however, he said: "What more can be done to accomplish this desirable result?" What desirable result? The complete forgiveness of Mr. Pike and capture of the Hayes Council. What had they already done? Robinson asks what more can be done. Let us see what they had done. They had found a haven of rest under the sheltering wings of the Hayes body, but no sooner were they in than they began to plot for the capture of the organization under the direction of Mr. Pike. Their oaths amounted to nothing. Remorse only seemed to fill their souls and their only ambition to be a return to the embrace of Mr. Pike and his Southern Council.

It 1864 they changed the Constitution of the body unlawfully as the first move. In October, 1865, the name of the Council was unlawfully changed and a committee appointed to visit the Southern Council. In December, 1865, a Pike 33d was admitted as a visitor. This same month the committee appointed to visit the Pike Council reported the result of their mission. This same month it is said that Hayes resigned his office, and was succeeded by Robinson. This same month it is also said that Seymour was expelled. In April, 1866, a committee again visited the Pike Council and reported the result to this June meeting, at which the address was delivered, quoted above. You must remember now that Mr. Thompson was a party to all this, and that Mr. Gorman and his people claim that the Hayes body was all right until Robinson reorganized the Raymond body in Boston.

It is said that there was an understanding between the Hayes and Robinson people, and that all was done was in conformity with that understanding. I think that I have demonstrated that Mr. Thompson could not take part in the above proceedings and be deceived, but I am not through with his case yet. I believe that I have also demonstrated that Mr. Thompson had no right as a Lieutenant Grand Commander, John L. Lewis having succeeded him. We will now trace up the subsequent record of Mr. Thompson and see what became of him. N. J. Proceedings for 1873,

p. 53, contains the following letter from Mr. Thompson, which will speak for itself:

NEW YORK, *November* 4, 1873.

To the Supreme Council for the Northern
Masonic Jurisdiction of the United States:

The undersigned respectfully represents that in 1862 he was Lieutenant Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, of which Ill.·. Edmund B. Hayes was Grand Commander; that in order to aid the union of that Supreme Council with the one of which Edward A. Raymond was Grand Commander, he resigned his said office, but did not resign his membership; that on account of sickness, long continued, he did not give attention to the matter until after the union of 1867, and that under the treaty by which the union was formed in 1867 he is entitled to rank as an Emeritus Member of the Supreme Council. *That he has taken the oath of fealty.* He prays therefore that the matter may be examined, and that he may be enrolled as an Emeritus Member.

Courteously and fraternally submitted.

HOPKINS THOMPSON,
Past P. Grand Lieutenant Commander.

Page 57 of the above proceedings shows that Mr. Thompson's request was granted, and that he became a member of the Northern Jurisdiction in good faith. *The above evidence disposes of Mr. Thompson and his claims.*

I will now proceed to show you why the Gorman body was organized. Mr. John J. Gorman, its present head, claimed that he had received the Scottish Rite degrees in the rite of Memphis, and asked the Northern Jurisdiction to heal him as a 33d in 1870. N. J. Proceedings, 1870, p. 6, shows that Mr. Gorman and others petitioned the Northern Jurisdiction to be healed as 33d, they claiming that they had received that and the preceding degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, in the Memphis rite. Their petition was referred to a committee, and the Northern Jurisdiction refused to grant the request of Mr. Gorman, consequently Mr. Gorman turns up as a 33d in the body organized by Mr. Thompson. I do not say that Mr. Gorman went into this body on that account, but my opinion is that, if the Northern Jurisdiction had granted his request in 1870 and healed him as a 33d, he might be there now instead of where he is.

It is said by some that the present Gorman body was organized for the purpose of making a gentleman a 33d who was refused that honor in the Northern Jurisdiction. I have looked into the matter some and will give you the result. Mr. John G. Barker is the man, and he was one of the prime movers in the organization of the body. The N. J. Proceedings for 1873, p. 65, show that John G. Barker was elected to receive the 33°, but he never received it. The reason said to be for his not receiving it is that

Charles T. McClenachen objected to him. There is no question but Mr. Barker was *the man who pulled the strings* in organizing this body, and he was the first one to receive the 33° erund Mr. Thompson. Mr. Thompson called his meeting September 27, 1881, and on the following day at a special meeting, Mr. Barker was made a 33d, and the Grand Secretary-General of the Council at the first regular meeting thereafter. Mr. Thompson, Mr. Barker and the others claim that they were ignorant of what transpired in 1866, until the reprint appeared in 1881. I think that I have shown Mr. Thompson could not have been ignorant, and I think I can show that Mr. Barker had copies of the original of the reprint as early as 1874.

Josiah H. Drummond of Portland, Maine, in a letter which is published in the Official Bulletin of the Southern Jurisdiction, Vol. 7, No. 1, dated July, 1885, states that the proceedings of the 1866 meeting were published early in 1867, and were distributed all over the country, were sold in open market, and were to be found in every Masonic library of any pretensions. They were reprinted in 1881 (he states) under my supervision, word for word, as nearly as possible, and the reprint was circulated all over the country.

The above is a pretty clear statement, and I think it will convince you that the original of the reprint was not hard to obtain. In 1874, Mr. Barker bought out what was known as the Masonic Publishing Company, under Macoy and Sickles, and among the books bought was quite a number of copies of the original proceedings published, as Mr. Drummond states, in 1867, so that it is fair to presume that Mr. Barker knew just as well in 1874, if not sooner, what transpired in 1866 as he did in 1881 from the reprint.

Before going further I wish to say to you that I have no feeling against Mr. Barker or those associated with him. I believe them to be in the wrong, and what I say is simply for your information. In this connection I will say, however, that I would like to know what authority you have for saying that Mr. Peckham "intends to unite with the Gorman body." I fear that you have been told this by some unreliable party. Address a letter to William H. Peckham, 4 and 6 Liberty Place, New York, using my name if you wish, and ask Mr. Peckham if such is the fact. The truth will do no harm.

In regard to my position, I will state that it makes no difference where I stand; I am not a member of the Pike or any other Scottish Rite body, but when asked for information I do not propose to stand idly by and allow friends of mine to enter the Gorman or any other body without telling them the plain, unvarnished truth. I understand from good authority that the whole aim of the Gorman body is to be healed and recognized by

the Northern Jurisdiction as 33ds as I said. I told you in my previous letter to stay where you were; you will find out how good that advice is when too late, if you have anything to do with the Gorman body. They have no organization in New York city, where the Masonic fraternity knows most about Cerneau Masonry. The Masons of New York know the truth of what I have told you in this letter, and it is impossible for those people to organize bodies in New York or vicinity.

Do not tell me that they have bodies unless you name the time and place where they meet so that we can investigate.

Fraternally yours,

(Signed) M. W. BAYLISS.

In a letter to another friend under date of November 29, 1890, Mr. Bayliss says: "Whatever you and your friends may do take my advice and *have nothing to do with Gorman and his body.* They are neither honest nor truthful. Keep away from them!"

And *this* is the so-called "Supreme Council of the United States of America, their Territories and Dependencies," of which the said Bayliss is now Grand Commander! *Verbum sat sap.*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 746 588 7